



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/898,089 | 07/05/2001 | Kyung-Pill Ko | P56497 | 3207 |
| 7590 | 08/04/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| ROBERT E. BUSHNELL | | | HAN, QI | |
| SUITE 300 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 1522 K STREET, N.W. | | | | 2654 |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/898,089 Qi Han | KO, KYUNG-PILL Art Unit 2654 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8,10-16 and 18-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8,10-16 and 18-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment dated 05/23/2005. The Applicant(s) amended claims 1, 3-8, 10-16 and 18-24, and canceled claims 9 and 17 (see pages 9-16).
3. Examiner withdraws the disclosure and claim objections, because applicant made correction (see pages 7 and 16).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-16 and 18-24, filed 05/23/2005 (see page 18-24) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, since applicant amended all independent claims that introduce new issue/new subject matter (see below).
5. It is noted that applicant challenges examiner's official notice regarding the rejection for claim 15 (see the argument in the amendment, pages 22-23). In response to this argument, the examiner provides a prior art (Bruck et al., US 6,008,836) as an evidence to support the previous official notice in this office action (see detailed rejection below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claim 6, the fourth limitation element of the claim is confused and contrary itself, because when “said language used in said OSD is automatically made to conform with said first language”, “displaying said OSD by means of ...said second language” would not be happened, which causes the limitation being indefinite. In addition, the third limitation “where said first language...is one of said second languages” (means the second languages may include the first language) is in conflict with the fourth limitation “displaying said OSD by means of one of said first language and said second language” (means the second languages and the first language exclude each other), which may also cause indefinite problem.

Regarding claim 7, this dependent claim inherits all limitations of their parent claim(s).

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1, the amended claim recites “an OSD control section ...to display said OSD on a display section...in one of said first and second languages; wherein said language used in said OSD is automatically made to conform with said first language used in said operating system”. It is noted that this combined limitation introduces new subject matter, because the limitation lacks support in the specification.

Regarding claim 6, the rejection is based on the same reason describe for claim 1, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 1.

Regarding claims 2-5 and 7, these dependent claims inherit all limitations of their parent claim(s).

8. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the combined limitation (see above) also has enablement problem. It is note that the amended claim recites “to display said OSD ...in **one of said first and second languages**” (means possible to use second language) and at same time the amended claim also says “wherein said language used in said OSD is automatically made to conform with said first language used in said operating system” (means only use of first language), which is contrary

each other. Therefore, the claimed subject matter is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention, without undue experimentation.

Regarding claim 6, similar to the claim 1, the fourth limitation is contrary itself, because when “said language used in said OSD is automatically made to conform with said first language”, “displaying said OSD by means of ...said second language” would not be happened. Therefore, the claimed subject matter is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention, without undue experimentation. In addition, the third limitation “where said first language...is one of said second languages” (means the second languages may include the first language) is in conflict with the fourth limitation “displaying said OSD by means of one of said first language and said second language” (means the second languages and the first language exclude each other), which may also cause enablement problem.

Regarding claims 2-5 and 7, these dependent claims inherit all limitations of their parent claim(s).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. Claims 1-8, 16 and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MENEZ et al. (US 2002/0083453 A1), in view of HETHERINGTON et al. (US 6,469,713 B2) hereinafter referenced as HETHERINGTON.

As per **claim 1**, as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112 1st (see above), MENEZ discloses system and method for selecting language of on-screen displays

(OSD) and audio programs (title), which is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant such as a Palm Pilot (which is a hand-held computer) (paragraph 21), comprising:

“a language information-providing section for storing and generating language information about a kind of a first language”; (paragraphs 12-14, ‘operated using microprocessor... a remote control device...to select the language (inherently generating the information about a kind of language)’, ‘some of setups relate to the language for feature such as on-screen display (necessarily include storing language information)’, and ‘save (store) to memory the selection of the language (first language) selected’);

“an on screen display (OSD) generating section generating an OSD for setting a display environment of a display device”, (paragraph 20, ‘microprocessor 415 also generates the on-screen display (OSD) signals’, paragraph 10, ‘Fig. 2 shows... on-screen display (including setting a display environment)’, ‘wherein menu 14 enables a user to select the language in which on-screen display will be displayed and audio programs are broadcast...’)

“a memory storing a plurality of second languages used in said OSD”, (Fig. 4, block 421R ‘memory’; Figs. 1-3 and paragraphs 3 and 9, ‘a user can select the language’, ‘on-screen display’, ‘menu enable a user to select the language’, which inherently includes storing multiple languages in a storage for user selection); and

“an OSD control section controlling said OSD generating section to display said OSD on a display section of said display device in one of said first and second languages”, (paragraphs 20 and 9, ‘microprocessor (or microcontroller ,or microcomputer) 415R receives ...control signals’, and ‘executes the program subroutine (Fig.3) ... to provide the feature (including

selecting languages), ‘menu enable a user to select the language in which on-screen displays will be displayed’, also see Fig. 3,).

But, MENEZ does not expressly disclose the first language “**used in said operating system**” and “**wherein said language used in said OSD is automatically made to conform with said first language used in said operation system**”. However, the feature of providing language information used in operating system and changing language setting of user interface via system messages is well known in the art as evidenced by HETHERINGTON who discloses message, system and computer program product for dynamic language switching via messaging (title), comprising language change message for ‘changing a display language in a user interface’, providing ‘an operating system language’ and ‘permitting a run-time change of the display language employed for a user interface (interpreted as automatically changing displaying language) (column 2, lines20-42), and teaches that ‘system messages preferably include a language code’ such as ‘ISO Language Code’ and ‘operating system component, or dialog is preferably configured to receive (and also possible to send) language... and maybe registered as subscribers or “listeners” (which necessarily enable automatically changing language)’ (column 4, lines 5-52), and ‘a determination of whether the user interface content or format requires alteration (including language change) to conform to the received system message...’ (column 6, line 40-45), which suggests that the system has capability of automatically changing language via system messages for user interface (corresponding to claimed display device). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ for combining MENEZ’s OSD feature in the display device (user interface) with HETHERINGTON’s system message feature providing operating system language

information and changing display language in a user interface, for the purpose of employing system messages to alter a display language in a user interface (HETHERINGTON: column 1, lines 30-31).

Further, in another view, as stated above, MENEZ discloses that his invention ‘is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant (PDA) such as a Palm Pilot (a hand-held computer)’ that inherently includes a small operating system, so that the operating system necessarily uses at least one language for the on-screen display, which also can read on the claimed limitation.

As per **claim 2** (depending on claim 1), as stated above, MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON discloses “said one of said first and second languages is said first language used in said operating system”, (HETHERINGTON: column 2, lines 20-42; MENEZ: paragraph 21).

As per **claim 3** (depending on claim 1), MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON further discloses “said OSD control section is set to control said OSD generating section to display said OSD in said first language in accordance with said language information generated by said language information-providing section”, (MENEZ: paragraph 20, ‘microprocessor 415R receives ...control signals... from remote control unit 450’; HETHERINGTON: column 4, lines 20-42, ‘operating system component ... to receive (or send) language ... display change system message (control signals)’ from ‘remote control’ or an ‘application 202’, so that the combined system has capability of claimed features).

As per **claim 4** (depending on claim 1), MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON further discloses “said OSD control section controls said OSD generating section to display said OSD by means of one of said second language[s] when said first language is not one of said second

languages stored in said memory”, (MENEZ: paragraphs 13-14, ‘factory default language, generally US English’, ‘a user could modify the default language’, which suggests that if no selection or no way to select, the system will uses the default language, which reads on the claim).

As per **claim 5** (depending on claim 4), as state above, MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON discloses “said one of said second languages is a English” (MENEZ: Fig. 1 and paragraphs 13-14, ‘factory default language, generally US English’).

As per **claim 6**, it recites a method. The rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 1, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 1.

As per **claim 7** (depending on claim 6), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 5, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 5.

As per **claim 8**, MENEZ discloses system and method for selecting language of on-screen displays (OSD) and audio programs (title), which is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant such as a Palm Pilot (which is a hand-held computer) (paragraph 21), comprising:

“a computer body generating video signal data in response to the operation” and “said computer body storing first language information data about said first language and generating said first language information data”, (Fig. 4 and paragraph 20 ‘microprocessor (microcomputer) control signals... sends control information to VCR (including video signal data)’, ‘also generates the on-screen display (OSD)or confirmation EPG display screen (also interpreted as video signal data); paragraph 13, ‘users could ... select different languages for the on-screen displays (necessarily generating a language information data when a language is selected);

paragraph 14, ‘save (store) to memory the selection of the language (language information data) selected’, also see Fig. 3, ‘memory 421R’).

But, MENEZ does not expressly disclose the operation of said **operating system**” in the first limitation element above and “wherein said language used in said OSD is **automatically made to conform with said first language** used in said operation system”. However, the feature of providing language information used in operating system and changing language setting of user interface via system messages is well known in the art as evidenced by HETHERINGTON who discloses message, system and computer program product for dynamic language switching via messaging (title), comprising personal computers (column 3, line 12) having ‘operating system’ (column 4, lines 47-48) and providing various data processes (operations), including user interface display (for video) (Fig. 1 and column 3, lines 31-35 and column 4, line 6); language change message for ‘changing a display language in a user interface’, providing ‘an operating system language’ and ‘permitting a run-time change of the display language employed for a user interface (interpreted as automatically changing displaying language) (column 2, lines 20-42); ‘system messages (reflect operation of the operating system) preferably include a language code’ such as ‘ISO Language Code’ and ‘operating system component, or dialog is preferably configured to receive (and also possible t sent) language... and maybe registered as subscribers or “listeners” (which necessarily enable automatically changing language)’ (column 4, lines 5-52); and ‘a determination of whether the user interface content or format requires alteration (including language change) to conform to the received system message’ (column 6, lines 40-45), which suggests that the system has capability of automatically changing language for user interface (corresponding to claimed display device) as

claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ for combining MENEZ's OSD feature in the display device (user interface) with HETHERINGTON's system message feature providing operating system with its language information and changing display language in a user interface, for the purpose of employing system messages to alter a display language in a user interface (HEITHERINGTON: column 1, lines 30-31).

Further, in another view, as stated above, MENEZ discloses that his invention 'is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant (PDA) such as a Palm Pilot (a hand-held computer)' that inherently includes a small operating system, so that the operating system necessarily uses at least one language for the on-screen display, which also can read on the claimed limitation.

As per **claim 16**, MENEZ discloses system and method for selecting language of on-screen displays (OSD) and audio programs (title), which is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant such as a Palm Pilot (which is a hand-held computer) (paragraph 21), comprising:

"a display device having an input section coupled to a computer body (Fig. 4, black '403', '415R (microcomputer)', '400R', and connection (input means) between black '403' and other function blocks);

"a memory coupled to said input section for receiving first language information data representing a first language" "through said input section, and for storing said first language information data" (Fig. 4, 'memory', paragraph 20, 'users remote control device to select the language (language information data)... in on-screen display to be displayed (received)' and 'save (store) to memory the selection of the language (first language) selected');

“said display device displaying an OSD in said first language in response to said first language information data” (MENEZ: paragraph 13 and Fig. 2, ‘wherein menu 14 (selected menu item corresponds to the first language information data) enables a user to select the language in which on-screen displays will be displayed’; paragraph 20, ‘microprocessor 415R receives ...control signals... from remote control unit 450,... generates the on-screen display (OSD) signals...”);

But, MENEZ does not expressly disclose the first language “**used in said operating system**” and “wherein said language used in said OSD is **automatically made to conform with said first language** used in said operation system”. However, the feature of providing language information used in operating system and changing language setting of user interface via system messages is well known in the art as evidenced by HETHERINGTON who discloses message, system and computer program product for dynamic language switching via messaging (title), comprising language change message for ‘changing a display language in a user interface’, providing ‘an operating system language’ and ‘permitting a run-time change of the display language employed for a user interface (interpreted as automatically changing displaying language) (column 2, lines20-42), and teaches that ‘system messages preferably include a language code’ such as ‘ISO Language Code’ and ‘operating system component, or dialog is preferably configured to receive (and also possible t sent) language... and maybe registered as subscribers or “listeners” (which necessarily enable automatically changing language)’ (column 4, lines 5-52), and ‘a determination of whether the user interface content or format requires alteration (including language change) to conform to the received system message’ (column, lines 40-45), which suggests that the system has capability of automatically changing language

for user interface (corresponding to claimed display device). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ for combining MENEZ's OSD feature in the display device (user interface) with HETHERINGTON's system message feature providing operating system language information and changing display language in a user interface, for the purpose of employing system messages to alter a display language in a user interface (HETHERINGTON: column 1, lines 30-31).

Further, in another view, as stated above, MENEZ discloses that his invention 'is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant (PDA) such as a Palm Pilot (a hand-held computer)' that inherently includes a small operating system, so that the operating system necessarily uses at least one language for the on-screen display, which also can read on the claimed limitation.

As per **claim 18** (depending on claim 16), MENEZ further discloses "said memory storing second language information data representing a second language used in an OSD", (Fig. 4, block 421R 'memory'; Figs. 1-3 and paragraph 3, 'a user can select the language' in 'on-screen display', which inherently includes storing multiple languages information data for user selection).

As per **claim 19** (depending on claim 18), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 3, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 3.

As per **claim 20** (depending on claim 18), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 3, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 3.

As per **claim 21** (depending on claim 18), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 4, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 4.

As per **claim 22** (depending on claim 18), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 4, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 4.

As per **claim 23**, it recites a method. The rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 16, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 16.

As per **claim 24** (depending on claim 23), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for combination of claims 18 and 19, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 18 and 19.

10. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON as applied to claim 8, and further in view of CHENG (US 5,986,638).

As per **claim 10** (depending on claim 8), MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON does not expressly disclose “said display device displays a visual image in accordance with said video signal data”. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by CHENG who discloses a computer monitor with selectable icons (visual image) representing the monitor display parameters (interpreted as video signal data) (Fig. 2 and column 1, lines 40-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON for providing a computer monitor displaying icons that represents video display parameters, as taught by CHENG, for the purpose of providing more user friendly environment (CHENG: column 1, lines 48-49).

As per **claim 11** (depending on claim 8), event though MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON discloses “a memory for storing said first language information data”,

(paragraph 13, ‘save (store) to memory the selection of the language selected’), MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON does not expressly teach whether the “**display device comprise**” a memory or not. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by CHENG who discloses a computer monitor comprising memory 40 to preserve the video display parameters, including language (Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 20-24 and line 47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON for providing a computer monitor (display device) with a memory for storing video display parameters including language, for the purpose of providing more user friendly environment (CHENG: column 1, lines 48-49).

As per **claim 12** (depending on claim 8), event though MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON discloses “an OSD generator for generating said OSD; and an OSD controller coupled” “for controlling said OSD generator to display said OSD in said first language in response to said first language information data” (MENEZ: Figs. 1-4 and paragraph 20), MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON does not expressly disclose whether the display device comprises the OSD features or not. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by CHENG who discloses ‘a computer monitor comprising an on-screen display integrated circuit (OSD IC) 60 (OSD generator)’, ‘a microprocessor based controller comprising a central processing unit 20...’ and ‘on-screen display (OSD) manager’ (Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 10-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON for providing a computer monitor (display device) with OSD features and components, as taught by CHENG, for the purpose of providing more user friendly environment (CHENG: column 1, lines 48-49).

As per **claim 13** (depending on claim 8), even though MENEZ further ETHERINGTON discloses “a memory for storing said first language information data”, (paragraph 13, ‘save (store) to memory the selection of the language selected’), and “said memory storing a plurality of second language information data”, (Fig. 4, block 421R ‘memory’; Figs. 1-3 and paragraph 3, ‘a user can select the language’ in ‘on-screen display’, wherein inherently includes storing multiple languages in a storage for user selection), MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON does not expressly disclose whether or not the display device comprises a memory for storing the language related information. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by CHENG who discloses a computer monitor comprising memory 40 for preserve the video display parameters, including language (language information data)(Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 20-24 and line 47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON for providing a computer monitor (display device) with a memory for storing language data, for the purpose of providing more user friendly environment (CHENG: column 1, lines 48-49).

As per **claim 14** (depending on claim 13), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 4, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 4.

11. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of HETHERINGTON as applied to claim 8, and further in view of BRUCK et al. (US 6,008,836) hereinafter referenced as BRUCK.

As per **claim 15** (depending on claim 8), even though MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON discloses “to display said OSD in said language in accordance with said

language information data" as stated above (see claim 8), MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON does not expressly disclose "said display device comprising a first key activating said OSD and a second key setting said display device" for the OSD features. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by BRUCK who method and apparatus for adjusting television display control using a browser (title), comprising 'display device using a web browser' column 4, lines 1-2 and 'the on-screen display controls are controlled and manipulated using the television controls' that 'invokes (activates) the on-screen menu ...through front panel buttons 8 (keys)' (Fig. 1B and column 7, line 60 to column 8, line 2), which suggests that system has capability of implementing the claimed functionality. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON for providing a display device with keys for invoking and setting OSD and display features, as taught by BRUCK, for the purpose of providing directly and/or typically controllable buttons for user convenience (BRUCK: column 7, line 60 to column 8, line 2).

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

Art Unit: 2654

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria , VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
July 25, 2005


DAVID D. KNEPPER
PRIMARY EXAMINER